

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA**

Brock Fredin,

Plaintiff,

v.

Lindsey Middlecamp,

Defendant.

Case No. 17-cv-03058 (SRN/HB)

**ORDER**

Brock Fredin,

Plaintiff,

v.

Grace Elizabeth Miller et al.,

Defendant.

Case No. 18-cv-00466 (SRN/HB)

Brock Fredin,

Plaintiff,

v.

Jamie Kreil,

Defendant.

Case No. 20-cv-01929 (SRN/HB)

Brock Fredin, 1180 Seventh Avenue, Baldwin, WI 54002, Pro Se.

K. Jon Breyer, Kutak Rock LLP, 60 South Sixth Street, Suite 3400, Minneapolis, MN 55402, for Defendants Lindsey Middlecamp, Grace Elizabeth Miller, and Catherine Marie Schaefer.

---

Anne M. Lochner, Charles Gokey, and Haynes Hansen, Robins Kaplan LLP, 800 LaSalle Avenue, Suite 2800, Minneapolis, MN 55402, for Defendant Jamie Kreil.

---

SUSAN RICHARD NELSON, United States District Judge

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Brock Fredin's Motion to Reconsider filed in three related cases [17-cv-03058, Doc. No. 329; 18-cv-00466, Doc. No. 306; 20-cv-01929, Doc. No. 223]. Based on a review of the files, submissions, and proceedings herein, and for the reasons below, the Court **DENIES** the motion.

## I. BACKGROUND

This Court ruled on seven motions in its June 2, 2022 Order [17-cv-03058, Doc. No. 328; 18-cv-00466, Doc. No. 304; 20-cv-01929, Doc. No. 220]. Without seeking permission from the Court, Mr. Fredin responded by filing this motion to reconsider. In his motion, he contends that (1) the Court erred in calculating the fees awarded to defense counsel, (2) the Court applied the wrong legal standard to his motion for Rule 11 sanctions, and (3) the Court's rulings are inconsistent with Eighth Circuit precedent. (Pl.'s Mem. [17-cv-03058, Doc. No. 330; 18-cv-00466, Doc. No. 307; 20-cv-01929, Doc. No. 224] at 4-5.)

Defendants respond that Plaintiff's motion should be denied for three reasons. (Def. Kriel's Opp'n [20-cv-01929, Doc. No 231]; Def. Middlecamp, Miller, & Schaefer's Opp'n [17-cv-03058, Doc. No. 336; 18-cv-00466, Doc. No. 314] at 2.)<sup>1</sup> First, they contend that Plaintiff's motion should be denied because he never sought permission from the Court to

---

<sup>1</sup> Middlecamp, Miller, and Schaefer incorporate Kriel's opposition memorandum into their opposition. The Court, therefore, only refers to Kriel's opposition going forward.

file his motion. (Kriel's Opp'n at 1.) Second, they contend that his motion lacks merit for failing to identify newly discovered evidence or to cite compelling circumstances requiring reconsideration. (*Id.*) Lastly, they contend that the Court's imposition of sanctions was justified. (*Id.*)

## II. DISCUSSION

Local Rule 7.1(j) of this Court requires a party seeking reconsideration to first obtain permission to file such a motion. D. Minn. L.R. 7.1(j). A party may receive permission only by showing “compelling circumstances.” *Id.* Motions for reconsideration serve the limited purpose of “‘correct[ing] manifest errors of law or fact or . . . present[ing] newly discovered evidence.’” *Hagerman v. Yukon Energy Corp.*, 839 F.2d 407, 414 (8th Cir. 1988) (quoting *Rothwell Cotton Co. v. Rosenthal & Co.*, 827 F.2d 246, 251 (7th Cir. 1987)).

The Court denies Mr. Fredin’s motion for failing to follow the procedural requirement in Local Rule 7.1(j). *See Ellis v. City of Minneapolis*, 518 F. App’x 502, 504 (8th Cir. 2013) (holding that a district court does not abuse its discretion in denying a motion where a party fails “to follow procedural rules”). Even assuming he had followed the applicable rule, the Court finds that Mr. Fredin has not established “compelling circumstances” necessary to obtain leave to file a motion for reconsideration.

Based on the submissions and the entire file and proceedings herein, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED** that Plaintiff’s Motion to Reconsider [17-cv-03058, Doc. No. 329; 18-cv-00466, Doc. No. 306; 20-cv-01929, Doc. No. 223] is **DENIED**.

Dated: September 6, 2022

s/ Susan Richard Nelson  
SUSAN RICHARD NELSON  
United States District Judge